IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Patent Application of	) **Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents**
	)
Krishna BHARAT *et al.*	) Group Art Unit: 2166
	)
Application No.: 10/748,663	) Examiner: N. Ahluwalia
	)
Filed: December 31, 2003	)
	)
For: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR	)
PERSONALIZING AGGREGATED	)
NEWS CONTENT	)

APPEAL BRIEF

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Sir:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in response to the final Office Action mailed

March 2, 2010 and in support of the Notice of Appeal filed May 3, 2010.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.   REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is Google Inc.

II.   RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals, interferences or judicial

proceedings.

III.   STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 23-31, 39-45, and 47-72 are pending in this application. Claims 23-31,

39-45, and 47-72 have been rejected and are the subject of the present appeal. Claims 1-

22, 32-38, and 46 have been previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims

23-31, 39-45, and 47-72 are reproduced in the appendix of this Appeal Brief.

IV.   STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment was filed subsequent to the final Office Action, mailed March 2, 2010.

V.   SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The following summary of the presently claimed subject matter indicates certain portions of the specification (including the drawings) that provide examples of embodiments of elements of the claimed subject matter. It is to be understood that other portions of the specification not cited herein may also provide examples of embodiments of elements of the claimed subject matter. It is also to be understood that the indicated examples are merely examples, and the scope of the claimed subject matter includes alternative embodiments and equivalents thereof. References herein to the specification are thus intended to be exemplary and not limiting.

Claim 23 recites: A method performed by one or more server devices, the method comprising: receiving, at one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a plurality of search queries from a client device (e.g., 325, Fig. 3B; page 8, line 19 – page 9, line 10); creating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries (e.g., 315, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 8-18); receiving, at one or more processors of the one or more server devices, an indication from the client device specifying a number of news items to include in at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19); retrieving, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, items of news content from memory using the plurality of search queries (e.g., 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); and inserting, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality

of the personalized news sections of the customized news document (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

Claim 31 recites: A news aggregation server, comprising: a memory to store instructions and news content (e.g., 230, Fig. 2; page 7, lines 3-7); and a processing unit (e.g., 220, Fig. 2; page 7, lines 3-7) to execute the instructions in memory to: obtain a plurality of search queries from a user (e.g., 325, Fig. 3B; page 8, line 19 – page 9, line 10), create a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries (e.g., 315, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 8-18), retrieve items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries (e.g., 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2), receive an indication, from the user, specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections, where the user-specified manner of ranking news items for one personalized news section of the plurality of personalized news section differs from the user-specified manner of ranking news items for another personalized news section of the plurality of personalized news sections, (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19), rank, based on the user-specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content, of the retrieved items of news content, in a ranked order (e.g., page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2), and insert the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

Claim 39 recites: A system, comprising: one or more server devices (e.g., 120, Fig. 1) comprising: means for receiving a plurality of search queries from a user (e.g.,

120, Fig. 1; 325, Fig. 3B; page 8, line 19 – page 9, line 10); means for creating a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries (e.g., 120, Fig. 1; 315, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 8-18); means for receiving an indication from the user specifying a number of news items to include in at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections (e.g., 120, Fig. 1; page 11, lines 3-19); means for retrieving items of news content from a plurality of sources of news content using the plurality of search queries (e.g., 120, Fig. 1; 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); and means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document (e.g., 120, Fig. 1; 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

Claim 40 recites: A method performed by one or more server devices, the method comprising: dividing, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a news document into a plurality of news sections (e.g., page 8, lines 8-18); receiving, at one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a first search query and a second search query from a client device (e.g., 325, Fig. 3B; page 8, line 19 – page 9, line 10); receiving, at one or more processors of the one or more server devices, an indication from a user of the client device specifying a manner of ranking news items within a first news section of the plurality of news sections (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19); searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items (e.g., 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); ranking, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices,

based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order (e.g., page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items (e.g., 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17); and populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

Claim 54 recites: A computer-readable memory device containing instructions for execution by one or more processors, the computer-readable memory device including instructions for performing a method, the method comprising: aggregating news content from a plurality of news source servers (e.g., 305, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 1-7); dividing a web page into a plurality of news sections (e.g., 315, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 8-18); receiving a personalized search query from a user (e.g., 325, Fig. 3B; page 8, line 19 – page 9, line 10); receiving an indication from the user specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19); searching the aggregated news content based on the personalized search query to obtain a first set of related news items (e.g., 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); and populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

Claim 64 recites: A method performed by one or more server devices, the method comprising: crawling, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices and using a web robot, news content documents hosted by a plurality of news source servers (e.g., 305, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 1-7); fetching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, news content from the crawled news content documents (e.g., 305, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 1-7); indexing, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the fetched news content to produce indexed news content (e.g., 310, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 1-7); dividing, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a news document into a plurality of news sections (e.g., 315, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 8-18); receiving, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a first user search query from a client device via a communication interface (e.g., 325, Fig. 3B; page 8, line 19 – page 9, line 10); searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items (e.g., 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); and populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

VI.   GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 23-31, 39-45 and 47-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

unpatentable over MIYASAKA et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,990,633) in view of

EICHSTAEDT et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,594).

VII.   ARGUMENT

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. should be reversed.

The initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention always rests upon the Examiner. In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner must provide a factual basis to support the conclusion of obviousness. In re Warner, 379 F.2d 1011, 154 U.S.P.Q. 173 (C.C.P.A. 1967). Based upon the objective evidence of record, the Examiner is required to make the factual inquiries mandated by Graham v. John Deere Co., 86 S. Ct. 684, 383 U.S. 1, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1966). KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007). The Examiner is also required to explain how and why one having ordinary skill in the art would have been realistically motivated to modify an applied reference and/or combine applied references to arrive at the claimed invention. Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp., 837 F.2d 1044, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1434 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

1. Claims 23 and 25-30

Independent claim 23 recites a method that is performed by one or more server devices. MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest one or more of the features in Appellants' claim 23.

For example, MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. do not disclose or suggest, among other features, inserting, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of

the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the

personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

The Examiner relies on Fig. 3; column 4, lines 27-43 (which describes Fig. 3); column 5,

line 62 – column 6, line 11; column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11; and column 17,

lines 57-67 of MIYASAKA et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 23 (Office

Action, pp. 3-4). Appellants submit that neither these sections, nor any other sections, of

MIYASAKA et al. disclose or suggest the above feature of claim 23. Thus, the Examiner

has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 23.

At column 4, lines 27-43, which describes Fig. 3, MIYASAKA et al. discloses:

> FIG. 3 provides a schematic illustration of a computer network in which various
> aspects of the present invention may be carried out. In the example shown, news
> server 5 performs the services described above and illustrated in FIGS. 1A, 1B,
> 2A and 2B. News server 5 obtains documents by subscription through network 1
> from content provider 4 and stores these documents in content database 44.
> Alternatively or in addition, news server 5 may search for and obtain the content
> of individual documents from databases or other repositories that are maintained
> by content provider 4 or others. News server 5 formats the content of these
> documents to provide to each recipient computer system 7 9 a representation of a
> customized newspaper having content that may be presented according to
> recipient preferences. Optionally, news server 5 may send the representation to
> each recipient according to individual scheduling preferences.

This section of MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a news server obtains documents

through a network from a content provider and formats the content of the documents to

provide a recipient with a representation of a customized newspaper having content that

may be presented according to recipient preferences. MIYASAKA et al. discloses that

recipient preferences include only topics, layout, and schedule (column 3, lines 20-25)

and does not disclose or suggest that the recipient preferences include a specified number

of news items to include in at least one of a plurality of news sections. Therefore, this

section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest inserting, by one or more

processors of the one or more server devices, selected items of news content of the

retrieved items of news content, <u>corresponding to a number of items specified by the user</u>

<u>to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections</u>, into the at

least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news

document, as recited in claim 23.

> At column 5, line 62 – column 6, line 11, MIYASAKA et al. discloses:

> Individuals having an existing subscription may review current preferences by entering a "user id" and an associated "password" in the spaces-provided and then "clicking" on the "GO" button with a pointing device such as a mouse. In response, news server 5 returns a form such as that shown in FIG. 5G, which gives a registered individual an opportunity to review and modify current preferences. This is discussed in more detail below.

> Individuals who wish to register for a new subscription may indicate this by clicking on the "START" button. In response, news server 5 returns one or more forms that allow the individual to enter personal preferences. Examples are shown in FIGS. 5B to 5G. Each of these examples may be implemented as an individual form, or essentially any combination may be implemented as portions of the same form. The order and content of these forms is not critical.

This section of MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a registered individual is given an

opportunity to review and modify current preferences on a form and individuals who

wish to register for a new subscription may enter personal preferences on a form. This

section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest that the preferences include a

specified number of news items to include in at least one of a plurality of news sections.

Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest inserting, by one

or more processors of the one or more server devices, selected items of news content of

the retrieved items of news content, <u>corresponding to a number of items specified by the</u>

<u>user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections</u>, into the at

least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news

document, as recited in claim 23. Rather, the preferences of MIYASAKA et al. include

only topics, layout, and schedule (column 3, lines 20-25), none of which reasonably

corresponds to a number of items to include in at least one of a plurality of personalized

news sections.

At column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11, MIYASAKA et al. discloses:

> The layouts in FIGS. 9E and 9F include an area designated "AD" in which an
> advertisement or other notice may be presented. The content of this area may be
> selected in a manner that is independent of recipient preferences; however,
> preferably content is selected according to what is estimated to be of greater
> interest to the recipient. This selection may be based on individual preferences in
> the recipient profile that are used to search for document content. In a preferred
> implementation, the recipient is presented with a form during the registration
> process that requests an indication of advertising category preference and,
> optionally, one or more keywords. A schematic illustration of a form that may be
> used for this purpose is shown in FIG. 5I. By obtaining recipient preferences for
> advertising, news server 5 can incorporate advertisements into each newspaper
> that are much more relevant or of much greater interest to the recipient. It is
> anticipated that operators of news server 5 can charge higher fees for such
> targeted advertising than can be charged possible for generic advertising. These
> fees can be used to defray costs of providing the newspaper, thereby reducing or
> eliminating any charge to the recipient.

This section of MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a recipient is presented with a form

during the registration process that requests an indication of advertising category

preference and, optionally, one or more keywords. This section of MIYASAKA et al.

further discloses that, by obtaining recipient preferences for advertising, the news server

can incorporate advertisements into each newspaper that are much more relevant or of

much greater interest to the recipient. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not

disclose or suggest that the preferences include a specified number of news items to

include in at least one of a plurality of news sections. Rather, MIYASAKA et al. merely

discloses that the preferences include an indication of advertising category preference

and, optionally, one or more keywords. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al.

cannot disclose or suggest inserting, by one or more processors of the one or more server

devices, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content,

corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of

the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the

personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At column 17, lines 57-67, MIYASAKA et al. discloses:

> By arranging the delivery control information in order by absolute delivery time,
> news server 5 may more easily carry out search, formatting and delivery steps
> discussed above according to recipient specified delivery schedules. If the
> recipient has requested delivery of a newspaper document or a list, news server 5
> may deliver the document or the list to the intended recipient in essentially any
> manner such as conventional mail or e-mail; however, delivery by e-mail is
> generally preferred. Alternatively, the newspaper document or list may be stored
> and made available for viewing or downloading in response to a request from the
> recipient.

This section of MIYASAKA et al. discloses that, if the recipient has requested delivery of

a newspaper document or a list, the news server may deliver the document or the list to

the intended recipient in essentially any manner, such as conventional mail or e-mail.

This section of MIYASAKA et al. has nothing to do with a specified number of news

items to include in at least one of a plurality of news sections. Therefore, this section of

MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest inserting, by one or more processors of the

one or more server devices, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news

content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least

one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of

the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

The Examiner has not explained how any of the above sections of MIYASAKA et

al. can reasonably be construed as disclosing the above feature of claim 23. Thus, the

Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 23.

The disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the

disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. set forth above.

The Examiner further states that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited references because both inventions are directed in the same field of study namely personalizing information and customizing presentation of the information to the user. Furthermore, the search results being presented based not only on the profile as in Miyasaka but also in response to the user input Eichstaedt improves and makes Miyasaka's method more adaptive" (final Office Action, pg. 5). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation regarding obviousness is merely a conclusory statement. Such conclusory statements have been repeatedly held to be insufficient for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. In this case, the Examiner has not explained why combining the disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. with the disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. would make "Miyasaka's method more adaptive," as alleged by the Examiner. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

Claims 25-30 depend from claim 23. Therefore, Appellants request that the

rejection of these claims be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to

claim 23.

　　2.　Claim 24

　　Claim 24 depends from claim 23. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection

of claim 24 be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 23.

Moreover, claim 24 recites additional features not disclosed or suggested by

MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al.

　　For example, claim 24 recites retrieving updated items of news content from the

memory using the plurality of search queries, and periodically inserting the selected items

of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into at least one of

the plurality of personalized news sections of the customized news document. The

Examiner relies on column 10, lines 14-27 and column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11

of MIYASAKA et al. as allegedly disclosing these features of claim 24 (final Office

Action, pp. 3-4). Appellants submit that neither these sections, nor any other sections, of

MIYASAKA et al. disclose or suggest the above feature of claim 24. Thus, the Examiner

has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 24.

　　At column 10, lines 14-27, MIYASAKA et al. discloses:

> As mentioned briefly above, an implementation of news server 5 may allow
> individuals to choose whether they wish to receive a newspaper having content
> selected automatically according to the individuals' profile information or
> whether they wish to receive a newspaper having content they select from a list
> of suggested articles. If an individual chooses not to select content from a list,
> news server 5 may use a method such as method 30 to provide the newspaper.
> The results of the search carried out in step 32 are used to select the content
> automatically. If an individual chooses to select content from a list of suggested
> articles, news server 5 may use a method such as method 50 to provide
> newspapers to that individual. Steps 53 and 54 present the list and receive the
> selection, respectively.

This section of MIYASAKA et al. discloses that if an individual chooses to select content

from a list of suggested articles, a news server may use a method to provide newspapers

to the individual. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest

inserting selected content, <u>corresponding to a specified number of news items</u>, into a

customized news document. In fact, this section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose

or suggest a specified number of news items at all. Therefore, this section of

MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest retrieving updated items of news content

from the memory using the plurality of search queries, and periodically inserting the

selected items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into

at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections of the customized news

document, as recited in claim 24.

As noted above, at column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11, MIYASAKA et al.

discloses that a recipient is presented with a form during the registration process that

requests an indication of advertising category preference and, optionally, one or more

keywords. This section of MIYASAKA et al. further discloses that, by obtaining

recipient preferences for advertising, the news server can incorporate advertisements into

each newspaper that are much more relevant or of much greater interest to the recipient.

This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest that the preferences

include a specified number of news items to include in at least one of a plurality of news

sections. Rather, MIYASAKA et al. merely discloses that the preferences include an

indication of advertising category preference and, optionally, one or more keywords.

Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest retrieving

updated items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries, and

periodically inserting the selected items of news content, corresponding to the specified

number of news items, into at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 24.

The Examiner has not explained how any of the above sections of MIYASAKA et al. can reasonably be construed as disclosing the above feature of claim 24. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 23.

The disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. set forth above.

For at least these additional reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

3. Claims 31, 69, and 70

Independent claim 31 recites a news aggregation server. MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest one or more of the features in Appellants' claim 31.

For example, MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. do not disclose or suggest a processing unit to execute instructions in memory to receive an indication, from the user, specifying a manner of ranking news items within the plurality of personalized news sections, where the user-specified manner of ranking news items for one personalized news section of the plurality of personalized news section differs from the user-specified manner of ranking news items for another personalized news section of the plurality of personalized news sections, as recited in claim 31. The Examiner relies on Fig. 3; column 4, lines 27-43 (which describes Fig. 3); column 5, line 62 – column 6, line 11; column 9, lines 22-28; column 13, lines 1-7; column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11;

and column 17, lines 57-67 of MIYASAKA et al. as allegedly disclosing a processing

unit to execute instructions in memory to receive an indication, from the user, specifying

a manner of ranking news items within the plurality of personalized news sections,

(Office Action, pp. 3-4). Appellants submit that neither these sections, nor any other

sections, of MIYASAKA et al. disclose or suggest the above feature of claim 31. Thus,

the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim

31.

As noted above, at column 4, lines 27-43, which describes Fig. 3, MIYASAKA et

al. discloses that a news server obtains documents through a network from a content

provider and formats the content of the documents to provide a recipient with a

representation of a customized newspaper having content that may be presented

according to recipient preferences. As noted above, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that the

recipient preferences include only topics, layout, and schedule (column 3, lines 20-25).

This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest that the recipient

preferences include an indication specifying a manner of ranking news items. Therefore,

this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest a processing unit to execute

instructions in memory to receive an indication, from the user, specifying a manner of

ranking news items within the plurality of personalized news sections, where the user-

specified manner of ranking news items for one personalized news section of the plurality

of personalized news section differs from the user-specified manner of ranking news

items for another personalized news section of the plurality of personalized news

sections, as recited in claim 31.

As noted above, at column 5, line 62 – column 6, line 11, MIYASAKA et al.

discloses that a registered individual is given an opportunity to review and modify current

preferences on a form and individuals who wish to register for a new subscription may

enter personal preferences on a form. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not

disclose or suggest that the preferences include an indication specifying a manner of

ranking news items. In fact, MIYASAKA et al. specifically discloses that the preferences

include topics, layout, and schedule (column 3, lines 20-25). Therefore, this section of

MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest a processing unit to execute instructions in

memory to receive an indication, from the user, specifying a manner of ranking news

items within the plurality of personalized news sections, where the user-specified manner

of ranking news items for one personalized news section of the plurality of personalized

news section differs from the user-specified manner of ranking news items for another

personalized news section of the plurality of personalized news sections, as recited in

claim 31.

At column 9, lines 22-28, MIYASAKA et al. discloses:

> One factor is the relative priority of the topic. If an individual is allowed to rank
> topics such as that discussed above and shown in FIG. 5B, a document having
> content that pertains to the highest rated topic will be given a higher measure of
> interest than will be given to a document with content that pertains to a lower
> ranked topic, all other factors being equal.

This section of MIYASAKA et al. discloses that, if an individual is allowed to rank

topics, a document having content that pertains to the highest rated topic will be given a

higher measure of interest than will be given to a document with content that pertains to a

lower ranked topic. This section of MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a user may rank

topics of interest and documents are ranked based on the indicated topics. This section of

MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose that a user-specified manner of ranking news items

for one personalized news section of a plurality of personalized news section differs from

a user-specified manner of ranking news items for another personalized news section of a

plurality of personalized news sections. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al.

does not disclose or suggest a processing unit to execute instructions in memory to

receive an indication, from the user, specifying a manner of ranking news items within

the plurality of personalized news sections, where the user-specified manner of ranking

news items for one personalized news section of the plurality of personalized news

section differs from the user-specified manner of ranking news items for another

personalized news section of the plurality of personalized news sections, as recited in

claim 31.

At column 13, lines 1-7, MIYASAKA et al. discloses:

> As mentioned above, a variety of techniques may be used to rank documents
> according to predicted measures of recipient interest or interest. Alternatively, the
> documents may be presented in any arbitrary order such as by alphabetic order of
> document content title, date/time order specified by the content provider, or order
> in which the content is stored in content database 44.

This section of MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a variety of techniques may be used to

rank documents according to predicted measures of recipient interest. This section of

MIYASAKA et al. discloses that the documents are ranked based on a predicted measure

of recipient interest. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose that a user-

specified manner of ranking news items for one personalized news section of a plurality

of personalized news section differs from a user-specified manner of ranking news items

for another personalized news section of a plurality of personalized news sections.

Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest a processing

unit to execute instructions in memory to receive an indication, from the user, specifying

a manner of ranking news items within the plurality of personalized news sections, where

the user-specified manner of ranking news items for one personalized news section of the

plurality of personalized news section differs from the user-specified manner of ranking news items for another personalized news section of the plurality of personalized news sections, as recited in claim 31.

As noted above, at column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a recipient is presented with a form during the registration process that requests an indication of advertising category preference and, optionally, one or more keywords. This section of MIYASAKA et al. further discloses that, by obtaining recipient preferences for advertising, the news server can incorporate advertisements into each newspaper that are much more relevant or of much greater interest to the recipient. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest that the preferences include an indication specifying a manner of ranking news items. Rather, MIYASAKA et al. merely discloses that the preferences include an indication of advertising category preference and, optionally, one or more keywords. This section of MIYASAKA et al. further does not disclose that a user-specified manner of ranking news items for one personalized news section of a plurality of personalized news section differs from a user-specified manner of ranking news items for another personalized news section of a plurality of personalized news sections. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest a processing unit to execute instructions in memory to receive an indication, from the user, specifying a manner of ranking news items within the plurality of personalized news sections, where the user-specified manner of ranking news items for one personalized news section of the plurality of personalized news section differs from the user-specified manner of ranking news items for another personalized news section of the plurality of personalized news sections, as recited in

claim 31.

As noted above, at column 17, lines 57-67, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that, if

the recipient has requested delivery of a newspaper document or a list, the news server

may deliver the document or the list to the intended recipient in essentially any manner,

such as conventional mail or e-mail. This section of MIYASAKA et al. has nothing to do

with an indication from a user specifying a manner of ranking news items. Therefore,

this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest a processing unit to execute

instructions in memory to receive an indication, from the user, specifying a manner of

ranking news items within the plurality of personalized news sections, where the user-

specified manner of ranking news items for one personalized news section of the plurality

of personalized news section differs from the user-specified manner of ranking news

items for another personalized news section of the plurality of personalized news

sections, as recited in claim 31.

The Examiner has not explained how any of the above sections of MIYASAKA et

al. can reasonably be construed as disclosing the above feature of claim 31. Thus, the

Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 31.

The disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the

disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. set forth above.

The Examiner further states that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art of data processing at the time of the present invention to combine the

teachings of cited references because both inventions are directed in the same field of

study namely personalizing information and customizing presentation of the information

to the user. Furthermore, the search results being presented based not only on the profile

as in Miyasaka but also in response to the user input Eichstaedt improves and makes Miyasaka's method more adaptive" (final Office Action, pg. 9). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation regarding obviousness is merely a conclusory statement. Such conclusory statements have been repeatedly held to be insufficient for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. In this case, the Examiner has not explained why combining the disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. with the disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. would make "Miyasaka's method more adaptive," as alleged by the Examiner. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

Claims 69 and 70 depend from claim 31. Therefore, Appellants request the rejection of these claims be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 31.

4. Claims 39, 71, and 72

Independent claim 39 recites a system. MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest one or more of the features recited in Appellants' claim 39.

For example, MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. do not disclose or suggest one or more server devices comprising means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 39. The Examiner relies on Fig. 3; column 4, lines 27-43 (which describes Fig. 3); column 5, line 62 – column 6, line 11; column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11; and column 17, lines 57-67 of MIYASAKA et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 39 (Office Action, pp. 3-4). Appellants submit that neither these sections, nor any other sections, of MIYASAKA et al. disclose or suggest the above feature of claim 39. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 39.

As noted above, at column 4, lines 27-43, which describes Fig. 3, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a news server obtains documents through a network from a content provider and formats the content of the documents to provide a recipient with a representation of a customized newspaper having content that may be presented according to recipient preferences. MIYASAKA et al. discloses that recipient preferences include only topics, layout, and schedule (column 3, lines 20-25) and does not disclose or suggest that the recipient preferences include a specified number of news items to include in at least one of a plurality of news sections. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest one or more server devices comprising means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of

the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 39.

As noted above, at column 5, line 62 – column 6, line 11, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a registered individual is given an opportunity to review and modify current preferences on a form and individuals who wish to register for a new subscription may enter personal preferences on a form. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest that the preferences include a specified number of news items to include in at least one of a plurality of news sections. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest one or more server devices comprising means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 39. Rather, the preferences of MIYASAKA et al. include only topics, layout, and schedule (column 3, lines 20-25), none of which reasonably corresponds to a number of items to include in at least one of a plurality of personalized news sections.

As noted above, at column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a recipient is presented with a form during the registration process that requests an indication of advertising category preference and, optionally, one or more keywords. This section of MIYASAKA et al. further discloses that, by obtaining recipient preferences for advertising, the news server can incorporate advertisements into each newspaper that are much more relevant or of much greater interest to the recipient. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest that the preferences

include a specified number of news items to include in at least one of a plurality of news sections. Rather, MIYASAKA et al. merely discloses that the preferences include an indication of advertising category preference and, optionally, one or more keywords. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest one or more server devices comprising means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 39.

As noted above, at column 17, lines 57-67, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that, if the recipient has requested delivery of a newspaper document or a list, the news server may deliver the document or the list to the intended recipient in essentially any manner, such as conventional mail or e-mail. This section of MIYASAKA et al. has nothing to do with a specified number of news items to include in at least one of a plurality of news sections. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest one or more server devices comprising means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 39.

The Examiner has not explained how any of the above sections of MIYASAKA et al. can reasonably be construed as disclosing the above feature of claim 39. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 39.

The disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. set forth above.

The Examiner further states that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited references because both inventions are directed in the same field of study namely personalizing information and customizing presentation of the information to the user. Furthermore, the search results being presented based not only on the profile as in Miyasaka but also in response to the user input Eichstaedt improves and makes Miyasaka's method more adaptive" (final Office Action, pp. 11-12). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation regarding obviousness is merely a conclusory statement. Such conclusory statements have been repeatedly held to be insufficient for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. In this case, the Examiner has not explained why combining the disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. with the disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. would make "Miyasaka's method more adaptive," as alleged by the Examiner. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

Claims 70 and 71 depend from claim 39. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of these claims be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 39.

5. Claims 40-43, 45, and 50-53

Independent claim 40 recites a method performed by one or more server devices. MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest one or more of the features recited in Appellants' claim 40.

For example, MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTADT et al. do not disclose or suggest searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40. The Examiner relies on Fig. 3; column 4, lines 27-43 (which describes Fig. 3); column 5, line 62 – column 6, line 11; column 9, lines 22-28; column 13, lines 1-7; column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11; and column 17, lines 57-67 of MIYASAKA et al. as allegedly disclosing these features of claim 40

(Office Action, pp. 13-14). Appellants submit that neither these sections, nor any other sections, of MIYASAKA et al. disclose or suggest the above feature of claim 40. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 40.

As noted above, at column 4, lines 27-43, which describes Fig. 3, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a news server obtains documents through a network from a content provider and formats the content of the documents to provide a recipient with a representation of a customized newspaper having content that may be presented according to recipient preferences. MIYASAKA et al. specifically discloses that the recipient preferences include only topics, layout, and schedule (column 3, lines 20-25). This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest that the recipient preferences include an indication specifying a manner of ranking news items. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

As noted above, at column 5, line 62 – column 6, line 11, MIYASAKA et al.

discloses that a registered individual is given an opportunity to review and modify current

preferences on a form and individuals who wish to register for a new subscription may

enter personal preferences on a form. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not

disclose or suggest that the preferences include an indication specifying a manner of

ranking news items. As indicated above, MIYASAKA et al. specifically discloses that

the recipient preferences include only topics, layout, and schedule (column 3, lines 20-

25). Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest searching,

by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, news content based on the

first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by one or more

processors of the one or more server devices, based on the user specified manner of

ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by

one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the news content based on the

second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating, by one or

more processors of the one or more server devices, the first news section of the plurality

of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and

populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a second news

section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as

recited in claim 40.

As noted above, at column 9, lines 22-28, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that, if an

individual is allowed to rank topics, a document having content that pertains to the

highest rated topic will be given a higher measure of interest than will be given to a

document with content that pertains to a lower ranked topic. This section of

MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a user may rank topics of interest and documents are ranked based on the indicated topics. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose that a user-specified manner of ranking news items within a first news section of a plurality of news sections. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

As noted above, at column 13, lines 1-7, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a variety of techniques may be used to rank documents according to predicted measures of recipient interest. This section of MIYASAKA et al. discloses that the documents are ranked based on a predicted measure of recipient interest. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest a user-specified manner of ranking news items within a first news section of a plurality of news sections. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of

related news items; ranking, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

As noted above, at column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a recipient is presented with a form during the registration process that requests an indication of advertising category preference and, optionally, one or more keywords. This section of MIYASAKA et al. further discloses that, by obtaining recipient preferences for advertising, the news server can incorporate advertisements into each newspaper that are much more relevant or of much greater interest to the recipient. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest that the preferences include a user-specified manner of ranking news items. Rather, MIYASAKA et al. merely discloses that the preferences include an indication of advertising category preference and, optionally, one or more keywords. Moreover, MIYASAKA's advertising would not reasonably be construed as news items. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by one or more processors of the one or more

server devices, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of

related news items in a ranked order; searching, by one or more processors of the one or

more server devices, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a

second set of related news items; populating, by one or more processors of the one or

more server devices, the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first

set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by one or more processors

of the one or more server devices, a second news section of the plurality of news sections

with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

As noted above, at column 17, lines 57-67, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that, if

the recipient has requested delivery of a newspaper document or a list, the news server

may deliver the document or the list to the intended recipient in essentially any manner,

such as conventional mail or e-mail. This section of MIYASAKA et al. has nothing to do

with an indication from a user specifying a manner of ranking news items. Therefore,

this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest searching, by one or more

processors of the one or more server devices, news content based on the first search query

to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by one or more processors of the one

or more server devices, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the

first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by one or more processors of

the one or more server devices, the news content based on the second search query to

obtain a second set of related news items; populating, by one or more processors of the

one or more server devices, the first news section of the plurality of news sections with

the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by one or more

processors of the one or more server devices, a second news section of the plurality of

news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

The Examiner has not explained how any of the above sections of MIYASAKA et al. can reasonably be construed as disclosing the above feature of claim 40. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 40.

The disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. set forth above.

The Examiner further states that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited references because both inventions are directed in the same field of study namely personalizing information and customizing presentation of the information to the user. Furthermore, the search results being presented based not only on the profile as in Miyasaka but also in response to the user input Eichstaedt improves and makes Miyasaka's method more adaptive" (final Office Action, pg. 14). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation regarding obviousness is merely a conclusory statement. Such conclusory statements have been repeatedly held to be insufficient for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. In this case, the Examiner has not explained why combining the disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. with the disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. would make "Miyasaka's method more adaptive," as alleged by the Examiner. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner

has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

Claims 41-43, 45, and 50-53 depend from claim 40. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection of claims 41-43, 45, and 50-53 be reversed for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 40.

6. Claim 44

Claim 44 depends from claim 40. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of claim 44 be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 40. Moreover, claim 44 recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al.

For example, claim 44 recites receiving an indication from a client device specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section, where populating the first news section comprises obtaining the number of news items from the first set of related news items. The Examiner appears to admit that MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose this feature and relies on column 4, lines 47-65 of EICHSTAEDT et al. for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 44 (Office Action, pg. 15). Appellants submit that neither this section, nor any other section, of EICHSTAEDT discloses or suggests the above feature of claim 44. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 44.

At column 4, lines 47-65, EICHSTAEDT et al. discloses:

> The notification processor 208 receives the results from the search processor 206, which includes indications about query matches and related matching documents.

> The notification processor 208 receives notification contact information relating to the users from the profile processor as shown at path 212. Using the notification contact information, the notification processor 208 transmits the information retrieved from the search to the appropriate user. The transmission may be over a network path, as shown at 214, or via some other transmission path specified by the users, such as fax or voice mail.
>
> The memory 210 is used to store the results produced by the search processor for later retrieval by the users. For example, if the user 110 enters a persistent query in the morning, the results can be retrieved later that day when the user 110 contacts the notification processor 208, which in turn, checks the memory 210 via path 216, to determine if there are any results to report to the user.

This section of EICHSTAEDT et al. discloses that, using notification contact information, the notification processor transmits information received from a search to the appropriate user. This section of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not have anything to do with receiving an indication from a user specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section, where populating the first news section comprises obtaining the number of news items from the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 44.

The Examiner has not explained how the above section of EICHSTAEDT can reasonably be construed as disclosing the above feature of claim 44. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 44.

For at least these additional reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

7. Claim 48

Claim 48 depends from claim 40. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of claim 48 be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 40. Moreover, claim 48 recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al.

Claim 48 recites receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content, where searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists. The Examiner appears to admit that MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose this feature and relies on column 4, lines 47-65 of EICHSTAEDT et al. for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 48 (Office Action, pp. 16-17). Appellants submit that neither this section, nor any other section, of EICHSTAEDT discloses or suggests the above feature of claim 48. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 48.

As noted above, at column 4, lines 47-65, EICHSTAEDT et al. discloses that, using notification contact information, the notification processor transmits information received from a search to the appropriate user. This section of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not have anything to do with receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content, where searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists, as recited in claim 48. In fact, this section of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not mention a journalist at all.

The Examiner has not explained how the above section of EICHSTAEDT can reasonably be construed as disclosing the above feature of claim 48. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 48.

For at least these additional reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

8. Claim 49

Claim 49 depends from claim 40. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of claim 49 be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 40. Moreover, claim 49 recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al.

Claim 49 recites receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news. The Examiner appears to admit that MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose this feature and relies on column 4, lines 47-65 of EICHSTAEDT et al. for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 48 (Office Action, pg. 17). Appellants submit that neither these section, nor any other section, of EICHSTAEDT et al. discloses or suggests the above feature of claim 49. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 49.

As noted above, at column 4, lines 47-65, EICHSTAEDT et al. discloses that, using notification contact information, the notification processor transmits information received from a search to the appropriate user. This section of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not have anything to do with receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news, as recited in claim 49. In fact, this section of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not mention a genre of news at all.

The Examiner has not explained the above section of EICHSTAEDT can

reasonably be construed as disclosing the above feature of claim 49. Thus, the Examiner

has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 49.

For at least these additional reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim

49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. is

improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

9. Claims 54-60, 62, and 63

Independent claim 54 recites a computer-readable memory device containing

instructions for execution by one or more processor, the computer-readable memory

device including instructions for performing a method. MIYASAKA et al. and

EICHSTAEDT et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not

disclose or suggest one or more of the features recited in Appellants' claim 54.

For example, MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. do not disclose or

suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web

page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to a user specified

number of news items to include in the first news section, as recited in claim 54. The

Examiner relies on Fig. 3; column 4, lines 27-43 (which describes Fig. 3); column 5, line

62 – column 6, line 11; column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11; and column 17, lines 57-

67 of MIYASAKA et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 54 (Office Action,

pg. 19). Appellants submit that neither these sections, nor any other sections, of

MIYASAKA et al. disclose or suggest the above feature of claim 54. Thus, the Examiner

has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 54.

As noted above, at column 4, lines 27-43, which describes Fig. 3, MIYASAKA et

al. discloses that a news server obtains documents through a network from a content

provider and formats the content of the documents to provide a recipient with a representation of a customized newspaper having content that may be presented according to recipient preferences. MIYASAKA et al. discloses that recipient preferences include only topics, layout, and schedule (column 3, lines 20-25) and does not disclose or suggest that the recipient preferences include a specified number of news items to include in a first news section of a plurality of news sections. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to <u>a user specified number of news items to include in the first news section</u>, as recited in claim 54.

As noted above, at column 5, line 62 – column 6, line 11, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a registered individual is given an opportunity to review and modify current preferences on a form and individuals who wish to register for a new subscription may enter personal preferences on a form. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest that the preferences include a specified number of news items to include in a first news section. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items <u>corresponding to a user specified number of news items to include in the first news section</u>, as recited in claim 54. Rather, the preferences of MIYASAKA et al. include only topics, layout, and schedule (column 3, lines 20-25), none of which reasonably corresponds to a number of items to include in at least one of a plurality of personalized news sections.

As noted above, at column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11, MIYASAKA et al.

discloses that a recipient is presented with a form during the registration process that requests an indication of advertising category preference and, optionally, one or more keywords. This section of MIYASAKA et al. further discloses that, by obtaining recipient preferences for advertising, the news server can incorporate advertisements into each newspaper that are much more relevant or of much greater interest to the recipient. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest that the preferences include a specified number of news items to include in a first news section of a plurality of news sections. Rather, MIYASAKA et al. merely discloses that the preferences include an indication of advertising category preference and, optionally, one or more keywords. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to a user specified number of news items to include in the first news section, as recited in claim 54.

As noted above, at column 17, lines 57-67, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that, if the recipient has requested delivery of a newspaper document or a list, the news server may deliver the document or the list to the intended recipient in essentially any manner, such as conventional mail or e-mail. This section of MIYASAKA et al. has nothing to do with a specified number of news items to include in a first news section of a plurality of news sections. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to a user specified number of news items to include in the first news section, as recited in claim 54.

The Examiner has not explained how any of the above sections of MIYASAKA et

al. can reasonably be construed as disclosing the above feature of claim 54. Thus, the

Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 54.

The disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the

disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. set forth above.

The Examiner further states that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art of data processing at the time of the present invention to combine the

teachings of cited references because both inventions are directed in the same field of

study namely personalizing information and customizing presentation of the information

to the user. Furthermore, the search results being presented based not only on the profile

as in Miyasaka but also in response to the user input Eichstaedt improves and makes

Miyasaka's method more adaptive" (final Office Action, pg. 19). Appellants submit that

the Examiner's allegation regarding obviousness is merely a conclusory statement. Such

conclusory statements have been repeatedly held to be insufficient for establishing a

prima facie case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International

Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir.

2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by

mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some

rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. In this case, the

Examiner has not explained why combining the disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. with

the disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. would make "Miyasaka's method more adaptive," as

alleged by the Examiner. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner

has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 54

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

Claims 55-60, 62, and 63 depend from claim 54. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of these claims be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 54.

10. Claim 61

Claim 61 depends from claim 54. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of claim 61 be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 54. Moreover, claim 61 recites additional features not disclosed or suggested by MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al.

Claim 61 recites receiving an indication from the user specifying preferences for journalists who author new items of the news content, where searching the news content based on the personalized search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists. The Examiner appears to admit that MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose this feature and relies on column 4, lines 47-65 of EICHSTAEDT et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 61 (final Office Action, pp. 21-22). Appellants submit that neither this section, nor any other section, of MIYASAKA et al. discloses or suggests the above feature of claim 61. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 61.

As noted above, at column 4, lines 47-65, EICHSTAEDT et al. discloses that, using notification contact information, the notification processor transmits information received form a search to the appropriate user. This section of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not have anything to do with receiving an indication from the user specifying preferences

for journalists who author new items of the news content, where searching the news content based on the personalized search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists, as recited in claim 61. In fact, this section of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not mention a journalist at all.

The Examiner has not explained how the above section of EICHSTAEDT can reasonably be construed as disclosing the above feature of claim 61. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 61.

For at least these additional reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

11. Claims 64-67

Independent claim 64 recites a method that is performed by one or more server devices. MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest one or more of the features recited in claim 64.

For example, MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. do not disclose or suggest receiving, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a first user search query; searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64. The Examiner relies on Fig. 3; column 4, lines 27-43 (which describes Fig. 3); column 5, line 62 – column 6, line

11; column 9, lines 22-28; column 13, lines 1-7; column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11; and column 17, lines 57-67 of MIYASAKA et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 64 (Office Action, pg. 23). Appellants submit that neither these sections, nor any other sections, of MIYASAKA et al. disclose or suggest the above feature of claim 64. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 64.

As noted above, at column 4, lines 27-43, which describes Fig. 3, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a news server obtains documents through a network from a content provider and formats the content of the documents to provide a recipient with a representation of a customized newspaper having content that may be presented according to recipient preferences. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the documents. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest receiving, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a first user search query; searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As noted above, at column 5, line 62 – column 6, line 11, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a registered individual is given an opportunity to review and modify current preferences on a form and individuals who wish to register for a new subscription may enter personal preferences on a form. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not

disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with a first set of news items. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest receiving, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a first user search query; searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As noted above, at column 13, line 55 – column 14, line 11, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that a recipient is presented with a form during the registration process that requests an indication of advertising category preference and, optionally, one or more keywords. This section of MIYASAKA et al. further discloses that, by obtaining recipient preferences for advertising, the news server can incorporate advertisements into each newspaper that are much more relevant or of much greater interest to the recipient. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with a first set of news items. Moreover, MIYASAKA et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the advertisements correspond to or include news items. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest receiving, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a first user search query; searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, only a first news section of a plurality of

news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As noted above, at column 17, lines 57-67, MIYASAKA et al. discloses that, if the recipient has requested delivery of a newspaper document or a list, the news server may deliver the document or the list to the intended recipient in essentially any manner, such as conventional mail or e-mail. This section of MIYASAKA et al. has nothing to do with populating only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with a first set of news items. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest receiving, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a first user search query; searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

The Examiner has not explained how any of the above sections of MIYASAKA et al. can reasonably be construed as disclosing the above feature of claim 64. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 64.

The disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. set forth above.

The Examiner further states that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited references because both inventions are directed in the same field of study namely personalizing information and customizing presentation of the information

to the user. Furthermore, the search results being presented based not only on the profile as in Miyasaka but also in response to the user input Eichstaedt improves and makes Miyasaka's method more adaptive" (final Office Action, pg. 24). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation regarding obviousness is merely a conclusory statement. Such conclusory statements have been repeatedly held to be insufficient for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. In this case, the Examiner has not explained why combining the disclosure of EICHSTAEDT et al. with the disclosure of MIYASAKA et al. would make "Miyasaka's method more adaptive," as alleged by the Examiner. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on MIYASAKA et al. and EICHSTAEDT et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

Claims 65-67 depend from claim 64. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of these claims be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 64.

VIII.   CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing arguments, Appellants respectfully solicit the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections of claims 23-31, 39-45, and 47-72.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP

By: /Meagan S. Walling, Reg. No. 60,112/
     Meagan S. Walling
     Reg. No. 60,112

Date: July 6, 2010

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (571) 432-0800
Facsimile: (571) 432-0808

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 44989

IX.   APPENDIX

1-22.   (canceled)

23.   A method performed by one or more server devices, the method comprising:

receiving, at one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a plurality of search queries from a client device;

creating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries;

receiving, at one or more processors of the one or more server devices, an indication, from the client device, specifying a number of news items to include in at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections;

retrieving, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, items of news content from memory using the plurality of search queries; and

inserting, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document.

24.   The method of claim 23, further comprising:

retrieving updated items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries; and

periodically inserting the selected items of news content of the updated items of

news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into the at least one

of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document.

25.   The method of claim 23, where the items of news content are retrieved from a

plurality of news source servers and aggregated via a news aggregation service in the

memory.

26.   The method of claim 25, where the customized news document is hosted at a

news aggregation server that further hosts the news aggregation service.

27.   The method of claim 25, where the customized news document is hosted at a

server that is remote from a news aggregation server that hosts the news aggregation

service.

28.   The method of claim 23, further comprising:

        notifying the client device of the updated items of news content.

29.   The method of claim 28, where notifying the client device of the updated items

of news content comprises notifying a user of the client device via at least one of a page,

an e-mail, a FAX, and a telephone call.

30.   The method of claim 23, further comprising:

        registering the customized news document with a registry; and

providing access for other users to the customized news document via the

registry.

31.   A news aggregation server, comprising:

a memory to store instructions and news content; and

a processing unit to execute the instructions in memory to:

obtain a plurality of search queries from a user,

create a customized news document including a plurality of personalized

news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of

search queries,

retrieve items of news content from the memory using the plurality of

search queries,

receive an indication, from the user, specifying a manner of ranking news

items within the plurality of personalized news sections, where the user-specified

manner of ranking news items for one personalized news section of the plurality

of personalized news section differs from the user-specified manner of ranking

news items for another personalized news section of the plurality of personalized

news sections,

rank, based on the user-specified manner of ranking news items, selected

items of news content, of the retrieved items of news content, in a ranked order,

and

insert the selected items of news content, of the retrieved items of news

content, in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news

sections of the customized news document.

32-38. (canceled)

39.   A system, comprising:

one or more server devices comprising:

means for receiving a plurality of search queries from a user;

means for creating a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries;

means for receiving an indication from the user specifying a number of news items to include in at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections;

means for retrieving items of news content from a plurality of sources of news content using the plurality of search queries; and

means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document.

40.   A method performed by one or more server devices, comprising:

dividing, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a news document into a plurality of news sections;

receiving, at one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a first search query and a second search query from a client device;

receiving, at one or more processors of the one or more server devices, an

indication from a user of the client device specifying a manner of ranking news items

within a first news section of the plurality of news sections;

searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, news

content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items;

ranking, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, based on

the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a

ranked order;

searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the news

content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items;

populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the first

news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in

the ranked order; and

populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a second

news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items.

41.   The method of claim 40, where the first and second search queries are received

from the client device via a network.

42.   The method of claim 40, where the first and second search queries are selected

by a user of the client device from a list of search queries.

43.   The method of claim 42, where the list of search queries comprises search

queries previously used by the user to search the news content.

44.   The method of claim 40, further comprising:

receiving an indication from the client device specifying a number of news items

to include in the first news section,

where populating the first news section comprises obtaining the number of news
items from the first set of related news items.

45.   The method of claim 40, further comprising:

receiving an indication from the client device specifying one or more preferences

for certain kinds of news sources for the news content,

where searching the news content based on the first search query is further based

on the one or more preferences.

46.   (canceled)

47.   The method of claim 40, where ranking, based on the user specified manner of

ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order comprises:

receiving selected keywords from the user; and

boosting selected news items of the first set of related news items higher in the

ranked order when the selected news items contain one or more of the selected keywords.

48.   The method of claim 40, further comprising:

receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for journalists who

author news items of the news content,

where searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists.

49.   The method of claim 40, further comprising:

receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content,

where searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news.

50.   The method of claim 40, further comprising:

deleting the first news section from the news document based on an instruction received from a user.

51.   The method of claim 40, further comprising:

labeling, on the news document, the first news section with a first label related to the first search query.

52.   The method of claim 51, further comprising:

labeling, on the news document, the second news section with a second label related to the second search query.

53.   The method of claim 40, where the first and second search queries are received from a user and further comprising:

providing the news document to the user.

54.   A computer-readable memory device containing instructions for execution by one or more processors, the computer-readable memory device including instructions for performing a method, the method comprising:

aggregating news content from a plurality of news source servers;

dividing a web page into a plurality of news sections;

receiving a personalized search query from a user;

receiving an indication from the user specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section;

searching the aggregated news content based on the personalized search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and

populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items.

55.   The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, where the personalized search query is received from the user via a network.

56.   The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, where the personalized search query is selected by the user from a list of search queries.

57.   The computer-readable memory device of claim 56, where the list of search queries comprises search queries previously used by the user to search the news content.

58.   The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising:

receiving an indication from the user specifying one or more preferences for certain kinds of news sources for the news content,

where searching the news content based on the personalized search query is further based on the one or more preferences.

59.   The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising:

receiving an indication from the user that specifies a manner for ranking news content within the first news section; and

ranking news items of the first set of related news items in a rank order based on the specified manner for ranking.

60.   The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising:

receiving selected keywords from the user; and

ranking selected news items of the first set of related news items based on the selected keywords.

61.   The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising:

receiving an indication from the user specifying preferences for journalists who

U.S. Patent Application No. 11/748,663
Attorney's Docket No. 0026-0063

author news items of the news content,

where searching the news content based on the personalized search query is

further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists.

62.   The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising:

receiving an indication from the user specifying preferences for genres of news

among the news content,

where searching the news content based on the personalized search query is

further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news.

63.   The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising:

providing the web page to the user.

64.   A method performed by one or more server devices, the method comprising:

crawling, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices and using a

web robot, news content documents hosted by a plurality of news source servers;

fetching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, news

content from the crawled news content documents;

indexing, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the

fetched news content to produce indexed news content;

dividing, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a news

document into a plurality of news sections;

receiving, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, a first

user search query from a client device via a communication interface;

searching, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, the

indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related

news items; and

populating, by one or more processors of the one or more server devices, only a

first news section of the plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set

of related news items.

65. The method of claim 64, where the news document comprises a web page.

66. The method of claim 64, further comprising:

obtaining a second set of related news items from the fetched news content; and

populating a second news section of the plurality of news sections of the news

document with the second set of related news items, wherein the second news section is

different than the first news section.

67. The method of claim 64, further comprising:

receiving a second user search query;

searching the indexed news content based on the second user search query to

obtain a second set of related news items; and

populating only a second news section of the plurality of news sections of the

news document with the second set of related news items.

68.   The method of claim 23, further comprising:

crawling, using a web robot, news content documents hosted by a plurality of news source servers;

fetching news content from the crawled news content documents; and

indexing the fetched news content to produce indexed news content stored in the memory,

where retrieving items of news content from memory comprises:

searching the indexed news content based on the plurality of search queries to retrieve the items of news content.

69.   The news aggregation server of claim 31, where the processing unit is further to execute the instructions in memory to:

retrieve updated items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries; and

periodically insert the selected items of new content of the updated items of news content in the ranked order into the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections of the customized news document.

70.   The news aggregation server of claim 31, where the items of news content are retrieved from a plurality of news sourse servers and aggregated via a news aggregation service in the memory.

71.   The system of claim 39, where the one or more server devices further comprise:

means for registering the customized news document with a registry; and

means for providing access, for other users, to the customized news document via the registry.

72.   The system of claim 39, where the one or more server devices further comprise:

means for ranking the selected items of news content based on a user-specified manner of ranking the items of news content.

X.   EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None

XI.   RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None